

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated July 16, 2003, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 14-20 have been withdrawn. Claims 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, and 13 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the claims.

The claims are under a restriction requirement placing claims 1-13 in Group I and claims 14-20 in Group II. Applicants affirm the election of claims 1-13.

The disclosure is objected to for several informalities. Applicants have amended the specification and believe that these changes overcome this rejection. Also, Figs. 14 and 15 have been amended to clarify that the channel is designated by the reference numeral 191 and the stop is designated by reference numeral 192. Also, the applicants have changed reference to handle 174 to "grip handle 174" to distinguish it from handle 176. Applicants have done the same with handle 202 renaming it "grip handle 202."

The claims are also objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and thus these informalities are believed to have been remedied.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-11 contain the term "normally", which the Examiner believes renders the claim indefinite. Applicants have removed the word "normally" from claims 1 and 11.

Claims 9, 10, and 13 have insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations of guide block and block. Applicants have cancelled 10 and 13 and amended claim 9.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Greco* (4,215,468). Applicants have substantially amended claim 1 to correspond to Figs. 16-20. Applicants believe that these amendments overcome this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *McDevitt* (4,583,287). Applicants have amended claims 11-13 to correspond to Figs. 13-15. Applicants respectfully believe that the *McDevitt* reference does not teach or suggest the use of two springs. The Examiner points to Fig. 2 for the teaching of two springs. However, applicants only can find one spring in Fig. 2 which is


not labeled. It should be noted that Fig. 2 has a threaded portion labeled 16 that is used for moving the device up and down.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims. Mainly, neither of the references teach or suggest each and every one of the elements as amended into claims 1 and 11.

Applicants respectfully believe that all rejections are overcome. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is directed to contact the undersigned directly.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50,2401.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Registration No. 38,049
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 10/15/03

Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500

